IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of

WALTER DEES

Serial No. 10/579,158

Filed: MAY 12, 2006

Title: CONSISTENT USER INTERFACE FRONT END FOR REMOTE USER
         INTERFACES

Atty. Docket

US 030450

Confirmation No. 7058

Group Art Unit: 2175

Examiner: ZAHR, A.A.

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

<u>APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF</u>

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answers mailed on February 2,

2010, please consider the following remarks:

REMARKS

Appellant maintains the arguments submitted in the Appeal

Brief filed on November 10, 2009 which is incorporated herein by

reference. Further, Appellant refutes the allegations made in the

Examiner's Answer of February 2, 2010.

In particular, in the Response to Argument section 10, in the

paragraph spanning pages 22-23 of the Examiner's Answer of February

2, 2010, column 11, lines 15-20 of U.S. Patent No. 7,027,881

(Yumato) is referred to which specifically recites:

> The conversion-into-remote-controller process is
> a processing sequence performed by the control device
> **and** the device to be controlled in cooperation in
> order that an electronic device serving as a control
> device is made to function as a remote controller
> capable of controlling a specific device to be
> controlled. (Emphasis added)

While the above noted section of Yumato makes the general

statement that conversion-into-remote-controller process is a

processing sequence performed by both the control device and the

device to be controlled, the specific details of the processing

sequence for converting the controller into a remote controller

reveal that it is "[t]he device **to be controlled** [that] **creates**

conversion-into-remote-controller **data** on the basis of this ability

information and transmits the **data to the control device**," where

"ABILITY information indicating the <u>ability</u> of an input operation

function **of the control device** is <u>transmitted</u> **from the control**

device to the device to be controlled." (Abstract, lines 8-11 and

lines 5-8; emphasis added)

Further, as clearly shown in Step S114 of FIG 6, and described

on column 13, line 58 to column 14, line 3 of Yumato, it is the

device to be controlled or "the audio component device 2 [that]

performs the process of step S114. Step S114 is a process for

creating conversion-into-remote-controller data on the basis of the

analysis result in step S113 described above." (Yumato, column 13,

line 66 to column 14, line 3; emphasis added)

Accordingly, it is clear that in Yumato, that it is the device

to be controlled or audio component device 2, and <u>NOT the control</u>

<u>device</u> or cellular phone 1, that creates conversion-into-remote-

controller data on the basis of the ability information of the

cellular phone 1. The device to be controlled 2 then transmits the

conversion-into-remote-controller data to the control device/cell

phone 1. Then, the control device/cell phone 1 creates a graphical

user interface (GUI) by using the received conversion-into-remote-

controller data. As a result, the control device/cell phone 1 can

function as a remote controller which remotely controls a specific

device to be controlled 2. Accordingly, it is very clear that in

Yumato, the <u>device to be controlled</u> or audio component device 2

<u>creates</u> conversion-into-remote-controller <u>data</u>, and the <u>control</u>

<u>device</u>/cell phone 1 <u>merely creates a GUI</u>, without any mapping of

one item into another.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in

independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 22,

amongst other patentable elements recites (illustrative emphasis

provided):

> mapping the RUI **[of the at least one network**
> **device]** to the CUI **by the control device**.

Mapping an RUI to a CUI <u>by the control device</u> is nowhere

disclosed or suggested in Yumato. In fact, Yumato is completely

silent about any mapping, and merely creates a GUI from conversion

data received from the device to be controlled. Even if it is

assumed, arguendo, that conversion is analogous to mapping, such

mapping or conversion is performed by the device to be controlled

in Yumato, and NOT by the control device.

Further, as correctly noted by the Examiner, Yumato is

completely silent about any synonyms. U.S. Patent Application

Publication No. 2002/0154161 (Friedman) is cited in an attempt to

remedy the deficiencies in Yumato.

Friedman is directed to creating a universal console (UC) 200 platform for a UC device 200 where canonical user interface (UI) description is used. Even if it is assumed, arguendo, that such a canonical description is analogous to a synonym used to replace the RUI (which is not the case as discussed below), as recited in independent claims 1 and 22 of the present application, in Friedman "**the device** or application **to be controlled** **sends** a canonical user interface (UI) description of **its** UI to the UC 200." (Friedman, paragraph [0029], lines 10-12; emphasis added) Further, "**[f]rom the canonical UI representation**, the UC device 200 is capable of recognizing both the action-commands." (Friedman, paragraph [0030], lines 1-3; emphasis added) Thus, any universal remote control user interface in Friedman is created by the UC 200 using canonical UI representation received from the device to be controlled.

By contrast, synonyms that replace parts of the RUI are included in a synonym database, as recited in independent claims 1 and 22 of the present application, and not received from the very same device to be controlled, where the CUI includes the synonym instead of its match in the RUI.

There is simply no disclosure or suggestion in Yumato,

Friedman, and combination thereof, of <u>mapping</u> the RUI to the CUI **by**

the control device by <u>replacing the RUI</u> <u>with a synonym that matches</u>

the RUI," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited

in independent claim 22.   (Illustrative emphasis provided)   The

Friedman UC 200 does not replace anything, but simply uses the

canonical UI representation itself <u>provided by the device to be</u>

<u>controlled</u>, where such canonical UI representation is **NOT any**

synonym to anything, but is basically the <u>UI itself of the device</u>

<u>to be controlled</u>.   And even if the canonical UI representation

includes synonyms, the Friedman UC 200 merely uses the 'RUI' or the

canonical UI representation provided by the device to be

controlled, without any replacement of any synonyms.

Accordingly, the allegation in the last full paragraph on page

24 of the Examiner's Answer is strongly disputed, and no synonyms

are used in the interfaces disclosed by Yumato and Friedman.

Rather, the canonical UI representation <u>of the very same device to</u>

<u>be controlled</u> is used, as disclosed in Friedman, and NOT any

synonyms to any UI of the device to be controlled.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that

independent claims 1 and 22 are allowable, and allowance thereof is

respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-21 and 23-31 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 22.

In addition, Appellant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, Appellant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-31 are patentable over Yumato and Friedman.

Thus, the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-31 should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

By_____
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Appellant
March 15, 2010

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101